



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,229	05/25/2001	Donald R. Youell JR.	ACP 2-021	2603

7590

07/17/2003

Jerry K. Mueller, Jr.
Mueller and Smith, LPA
7700 Rivers Edge Drive
Columbus, OH 43235

EXAMINER

DURAND, PAUL R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3721

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/865,229

Applicant(s)

YOUELL ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Durand

Art Unit

3721

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The additional limitation of "structural" to the claims requires further consideration.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____



Rinaldi I. Rada
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The final rejection is deemed proper since the argument in regard to claim 4 in the amendment filed on 1/29/03 argues the position of the examiner's Official Notice regarding the type of auto parts. MPEP 2144.03 states "A seasonable challenge constitutes a demand for evidence made as soon as practicable during prosecution. Thus, applicant is charged with rebutting the well known statement in the next reply after the Office action in which the well known statement was made. This is necessary because the examiner must be given the opportunity to provide evidence in the next Office action or explain why no evidence is required. If the examiner adds a reference to the rejection in the next action after applicant's rebuttal, the newly cited reference, if it is added merely as evidence of the prior well known statement, does not result in a new issue and thus the action can potentially be made final. If no amendments are made to the claims, the examiner must not rely on any other teachings in the reference if the rejection is made final." Since applicant has seasonably challenged the position of Official Notice and has amended the claim to correct § 112, second paragraph errors, the final rejection is deemed proper. Applicant also argues the teaching of Engles is improper and that there is no reason to combine Engles with the references of Gillio-tos et al and Wilkinson. Engles clearly teaches the claimed invention as it is recited in claims 1 and 3, While the invention of Engles discloses the backing board made of foam, he also contends that the prior art teaches that it is well known to ship automobile parts using paperboard. Furthermore applicant's claim makes no differentiation of heat versus vacuum when it comes to the method of shrink wrapping the wrapping onto the product. Still furthermore, in regard to claim 2, the teaching of Gillio-tos is relied on to show the applicant that it is old and well known in the art of packaging to provide a laminated backing to an object that is being packaged. Still furthermore, Wilkinson is cited as a teaching to show the applicant that it is well known to place a shrink wrapped item in a box or container.